

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that it contained a certain added and poisonous deleterious ingredient, to wit, 30 parts per million of arsenic as arsenious oxid per million, which might render said article injurious to health.

On October 9, 1913, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 30, 1914.*

**2940. Misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. v. Georgia Cotton Oil Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 4635. I. S. No. 14163-d.)**

On November 18, 1912, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Georgia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Georgia Cotton Oil Co., a corporation, Rome, Ga., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on December 8, 1911, from the State of Georgia into the State of Tennessee, of a quantity of cottonseed meal which was misbranded. The product was labeled: "100 Pounds Cotton Seed Meal Manufactured by Georgia Cotton Oil Company, Rome, Georgia. Guaranteed Analysis Protein 38.62%, Fat 10.50%, Fiber 7.50%, Carbohydrates 40.00%. Ingredients—Cotton Seed Meal."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Moisture (per cent).....	6.82
Ether extract (per cent).....	7.08
Protein (per cent).....	40.29
Crude fiber (per cent).....	11.13

Misbranding of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that the statements "Fat 10.50%" and "Fiber 7.50%" borne on the label thereof were false and misleading because said statements created the impression that the product contained the said amounts of fat and fiber, whereas, in truth and in fact, it contained a smaller amount of fat and a larger amount of fiber, to wit, 7.08 per cent fat and 11.13 per cent fiber. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the product was labeled and branded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, being labeled "Fat 10.50%" and "Fiber 7.50%," when, as a matter of fact, it did not contain said amounts of fat and fiber, but contained a smaller amount of fat and a larger amount of fiber, to wit, 7.08 per cent fat and 11.13 per cent fiber.

On May 16, 1913, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 30, 1914.*

**2941. Adulteration of milk. U. S. v. Henry M. Boggs. Tried to the court and a jury. Verdict of guilty. Fine, \$15 and costs. (F. & D. No. 4641. I. S. No. 17711-d.)**

On March 24, 1913, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Henry M. Boggs, Fullerton, Ky., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about April 19, 1912, from the State of Kentucky into the State of Ohio, of a quantity of milk, which was adulterated.

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Fat (by Babcock) (per cent).....	3.9
Protein (N $\times$ 6.38) (per cent).....	2.61
Ash (per cent).....	0.71

Total solids (by drying) (per cent).....	11. 90
Specific gravity—15.5° C .....	1. 0290
Solids calculated from fat and specific gravity—total (per cent).....	11. 94
Solids not fat—by drying (per cent).....	8. 00
Solids not fat—by calculation (per cent).....	8. 04
Preservative—formaldehyde.....	Negative.
Nitrates.....	Present.

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that a substitute, to wit, water, had been mixed with said article of food so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and further, for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been substituted in part for the article of food.

On May 27, 1913, the case having come on for trial before the court and a jury, a verdict of guilty was returned by the jury and the court imposed a fine of \$15 and costs.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 30, 1914.*

**2942. Adulteration of milk. U. S. v. Horris Maynard Morton. Tried to the court and a jury. Verdict of guilty. Fine, \$15 and costs. (F. & D. No. 4642. I. S. No. 17701-d.)**

On March 24, 1913, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Horris Maynard Morton, Fullerton, Ky., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about April 19, 1912, from the State of Kentucky into the State of Ohio, of a quantity of milk, which was adulterated.

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Fat (by Babcock) (per cent).....	3. 4
Protein (N × 6.38) (per cent).....	2. 58
Ash (per cent).....	0. 60
Total solids (by drying) (per cent).....	10. 63
Specific gravity—15.5° C.....	1. 0270
Solids calculated from fat and specific gravity (per cent).....	10. 83
Solids not fat—by drying (per cent).....	7. 23
Solids not fat—by calculation (per cent).....	7. 43
Preservative—formaldehyde.....	Negative.
Nitrates.....	Present.

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been mixed with the article of food so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and for the further reason that a substitute, to wit, water, had been substituted in part for said article of food.

On May 27, 1913, the case having come on for trial before the court and a jury, a verdict of guilty was returned by the jury, and the court imposed a fine of \$15 and costs.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 30, 1914.*

**2943. Adulteration of oil of juniper berries. U. S. v. James B. Horner. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 4650. I. S. No. 18156-d.)**

On April 22, 1913, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against James B. Horner, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on January 24, 1912, from the State of New York into the State of California, of a